DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 737 HE 010 054

AUTHOR Overall, Jesse D., IV
TITLE Higher Education and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the conference on The Federal Presence in Higher Education (University of California, Los Angeles, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Educational History; Federal Government; *Federal Legislation; *Government Role; Higher Education; *State Universities; Statistical Data; United States History; *Veterans; *Veterans Education
IDENTIFIERS *G I Bill; Servicemens Readjustments Act 1944

ABSTRACT

Discussed are the legislative evolution, nature, and impact of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (the G.I. Bill) on higher education. Influences on this legislation are traced back to Thomas Jefferson, and parallels with other federal legislation are discussed. The specific provisions of the act are treated, and the pervasive impacts of the act on the University of California are presented as examples of its nationwide influence. The paper concludes with an assessment of the legislation and suggestions of areas for further study. A bibliography, the bill's text, and limited statistical data are appended. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED154737

Higher Education

and

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

A paper presented at the conference on:

"The Federal Presence in Higher Education"

University of California, Los Angeles

1976

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jesse U. Overall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Presented by: Dr. Jesse U. Overall, IV
Professor
California State University

HE 010 054

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the legislative evolution, nature and impact of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (the G.I. Bill) on higher education. It traces influences on the G.I. Bill legislation back to Thomas Jefferson and his "Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge," and discusses parallels with the War Risk Insurance Act of 1917 and the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1918. The specific provisions of the Act are treated, and the pervasive impacts of the Act on two Universities is presented as an example of its nationwide influence. The paper concludes with an assessment of the legislation, and with suggestions of areas for further study.

"They lose their limbs in the service of the commonwealth or of the king, and their disability prevents them from exercising their own crafts, and their age from learning a new one."

--Sir Thomas More
Utopia, Book One.

"History will judge us not by the money we spend but by the future contributions we enable out veterans to make to their country."

--Pres. Harry S. Truman
Address delivered to
the U.S. Congress,
January 7, 1947.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Tables.....i

Introduction.....1

A Nation Establishes its Obligations.....3

Catalyst or Cause?.....6

Why Education?.....14

We've Only Just Begun (A Conclusion of Sorts).....21

Appendix

A List of Works Consulted

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Enrollment at USC--Day Division, 1946-1950	8
2.	Junior Colleges: Number and Enrollment	9
3a.	Candidates Examined by College Entrance Examination Board	10
3b.	College Entrance Examination Board Members, Institutions of Higher Education	10
4.	Educational Level of Veterans at Separation from the Armed Forces	18

Introduction

Fifteen million Americans were coming home. They--supported by their civilian countrymen and foreign allies--had just defeated the entire aggressive might of the autocratic axis powers. They were tired of fighting. They wanted to return soon to their families, their homes. They wanted to build a new life for themselves and their loved ones. And they hoped that this time, a lasting international order in which peaceful coexistence was the rule--not the exception--could be forged from the ashes of destruction. The flames of war had fused and tempered, made clear in their minds the significance of the democratic principles in whose defense they had struggled.

The leaders of the Nation were aware of these attitudes even before the war had ended. Many had served in the armed forces during that "war to end all wars," just a score or so years before. Others had soared momentarily to the heights of idealism. Then, they had descended heavily as the spirit of brotherhood which characterized those engaged in "making the world safe for democracy" was smothered by economic reality.

Now, the United States was in a similar situation. Whatever course it had followed after World War I had not been successful. Whatever course it embarked on after this war must be correct. Americans might never get another chance.

This paper is about those 15 million American servicemen. And it deals with one step by our leaders toward assuring and maintaining the Nation's heightened democratic committment, particularly for those who had grappled hand-to-hand in her defense. But this paper also deals with a concept--education--and a recognition of the fundamental role it plays in sustaining our democratic system.

Specifically, this paper will consider The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944[1], or, as the law is more popularly known, the G.I. Bill. It will initially touch on the historical background out of which the legislation evolved, then turn to direct and indirect effects of G.I. Bill veterans on our educational system, and finally consider why education was chosen as a benefit.

[1]Public Law 346, 78th Congress, second session, passed June 22, 1944.

A Nation Establishes Its Obligations

While the obligation of a group's members to provide for its defense and survival is a precept of long-standing acceptance, the extent of the group's obligation to those who bear arms in its defense has experienced a much slower definition. In feudal times, vassal service was a duty exchanged for a strong lord's protection. Physical or economic losses sustained in such service were individual matters to be considered at the lord's discretion. Though centuries passed and more wars were fought, the plight of the returning soldier continued to receive little official attention.

In the United States, official concern with war veterans slowly developed into a system featuring bonuses for those still alive at war's end, hospitalization for the disabled, and small pensions for wives of the deceased. Not until World War I did a most revolutionary change in approach to the veteran develop. Whether it came about as a result of humanitarian ideals, economic considerations, or the blunt reality that medical science was returning a higher percentage of soldiers to society from the battlefields, it is hard to say. It is certain that the passage of the War Risk Insurance Act of 1917[1] officially established the Government's responsibility for veteran readjustment.

[1]Public Law 90, 65th Congress, passed October 6, 1917.

Readjustment is a simple approach. It involves Government recognition of two facts: (1. that individuals trained in the arts of war may require some reorientation before returning to a post-war environment; and (2. that service in the country's armed forces may interrupt preparation for, or--because of disability--prevent participation in civilian economic activity. Realizing these facts, the most effective way to readjust returning veterans to civilian life is to provide them with personal job counseling and training necessary to permit their participation in the Nation's economic life. Provisions for such readjustment were proposed in the War Risk Insurance Act of 1917, and specific program implementation was outlined in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1918.[1]

The readjustment provisions of these two acts, however, applied only to the disabled veteran. After his physical disabilities had been cared for, he was given the opportunity for vocational training either on-the-job or at other educational or training institutions. Upon completion of his course of study, he was then eligible for placement by the Veterans' Administration.

What about the other four million men who were physically able? They received their $60 mustering-out pay and attempted to re-integrate themselves into the economy, an unstable economy which was already experiencing re-conversion problems, and which would soon experience the impact of a depression.

---

[1]Public Law 178, 65th Congress, passed June 27, 1918.

Lessons learned from the success of the disabled veterans' readjustment program, and the plight of many able-bodied World War I veterans in the tight post-war job markets, were not lost on the American people. When the nation found itself embroiled in another world war, it began almost immediately to plan for the post-war period. Of course, veterans organizations like the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, and Veterans of Foreign Wars were anxious that past inadequacies be corrected. In addition, members of the American Council on Education met with industrial and governmental leaders as early as the spring of 1942 to begin planning for the soldiers' return.

The results of this planning were many, but one of the most significant was The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.[1] Under this law, returning servicemen were provided with a variety of privileges aimed at speeding up their readjustment to society. Hospitalization, re-employment rights, and temporary unemployment benefits were some examples. The most significant benefit provided was the opportunity to pursue education and training, with most educational and some living expenses paid by the Federal government. The complete educational provisions of P.L. 346 can be found in Appendix I.

---

[1] Public Law 16 (78th Congress, second session), The Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1944, was similar in scope and intent to P.L. 178, The Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1918. It applied solely to disabled vaterans. Note, however, that disabled vaterans could choose training benefits under either 16 or 346.

For purposes of this paper, it should be sufficient to summarize the most significant provisions as follows:

Eligibility: any serviceman with at least 90 days service who was discharged under other than dishonorable conditions.

Duration: at least one year and up to four years, depending on length of service over 90 days.

Benefits: tuition, educational fees, and books paid for by the Federal government up to $500[1] at any approved institution /plus/ a subsistence allowence--based on number of dependents--in accordance with the following schedule:

	Monthly Amt.	Revised '45	Revised '48
0 dependents	$50	$65	$75
1 dependent	75	90	105
2 or more	75	90	120

These provisions were applicable at any training institution--business, educational, or otherwise--which was approved by the state, or which might additionally be approved by the Chief Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

Catalyst or Cause?

When one looks at the changes that occurred on the American educational scene during the post-war years 1946-1949, he may readily wonder what connection--if any--exists between the changes and the G.I. Bill benefits. At this time, the writer must confess to a lack of empirical evidence conclusively establishing any connection. On the other hand, the following discussion should establish firmly the connection between massive veteran enrollments and many of these changes.

[1] per year.

Determining links between the G.I. Bill and the massive veteran enrollments must remain a topic for further research. Suffice it to say that in this writer's opinion, the G.I. Bill was a catalyst in crystalizing educational desires of the veterans into needed solutions to potential post-war problems.

What were some of the major effects of post-war veteran enrollment? To begin with, college faculties and facilities had enjoyed some expansion in response to government war research and training needs. This expansion peaked in 1943,[1] and sharp enrollment declines with a resultant loss of student fees (and public financial support based on attendance) were experienced. The magnitude of this sudden influx after the war pressed institutional resources to the limit--and, according to some, beyond.

A look at the experiences of the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), and the University of Southern California (USC) are most revealing. Appendix II illustrates that, while some veterans were already attending UCLA during the spring semester 1945, the fall semester of 1946 marked the massive return of veterans pursuing training under the G.I. Bill.[2] This flow of veterans onto the campus eventually trailed off from a high of 7691 (fall 1946) to a low of 1924 (fall 1952).

---

[1] December, 1943, marked the downturn of Army and Navy training contracts. (28:20)

[2] Remember, the law was passed on June 22, 1944, and while the fighting ended in the Pacific late in 1945, the formal peace treaty with Japan was not signed until 1946.

Looking at the figures for fall, 1945, and spring, 1946, we can see that the veteran influx essentially doubled the enrollment at this institution to a level from which it receded only slightly during the Korean war years. The experience at USC was similar, as the following table attests:

Table 1
Enrollment at USC--Day Division

	1946-47	1947-48	1948-49	1949-50
Total Enrollment	--	16551	16400	--
Veteran Enrollment	11710	11449	10936	--
Veteran Enrollment As A Percent of Total	--	69%	67%	--

Source: (32:177)

Note that 69% of the day division 1947-48 enrollment consisted of veterans, a figure which slightly decreased during the 1948-49 period. Looking at higher education as a whole, Appendix III shows that over 50% of those enrolled at institutions of higher education during the fall of 1946 were veterans.

Two-year college classrooms were also feeling the squeeze. As we can see from Table 2 below, 149,854 students attended class on 461 junior college campuses in 1940. A sharp drop in enrollment and number of active institutions was experienced during the war years;[1] however, in 1946 combined enrollments at 464 campuses equaled and surpassed pre-war levels. By 1948, 240,173 students had chosen one of 483 available campuses, representing an enrollment growth of 35% from 1946 levels. The veteran impact was being felt everywhere.

Table 2

Junior Colleges: Number and Enrollment

Year	'20	'30	'40	'42	'44	'46	'48	'50	'52
Number....	52	277	456	461	413	464	472	483	480
Enrollment (thousands)	8	56	150	141	89	157	240	242	230

Source: (30:133)

In summary, the popularity and subsequent usage of the Bill by 7,800,000 of the more than 15 million World War II veterans can be seen in Appendix IV. Almost 29% of those using the Bill selected college-level training.

[1] Only 489 of 1702 institutions participated in Government contract programs; and, while 95 institutions were involved in Government research projects, 8 universities absorbed 90% of the funds. Because most of the work went to the larger institutions, many junior colleges received little if any federal support to compensate for declining male enrollments. (28:1)

Yet, if admission to college had remained largely a matter of previous high school performance, many veterans--most of whom had been out of school for a year or more--would have found entrance difficult. Perhaps as a result of many factors--among them the enrollment and tuition "famines" of 1944 and 1945, the successful and wide-spread use of aptitude and achievement testing in the armed forces, and a general feeling that servicemen deserved admission based on any defensible standard--admissions criteria were often broadened to consider not only past high school performance, but also service experience, aptitude, and achievement test scores. A Special Aptitude Test for Veterans was also made available for admissions purposes. Thus, this particular combination of circumstances was apparently influential in re-kindling an interest in the use of College Entrance Examination Board scores. The development of this interest and the impact of post-war testing can be seen in Tables 3a and 3b below:

Table 3a

Candidates Examined by College Entrance Examination Board

Year	'34	'35	'36	'45	'46	'47	'48
Number of Candidates	16360	15394	14499	32589	46087	65239	78158

Source: (10a:7, 10b:14)

Table 3b

College Entrance Examination Board Members, Institutions of Higher Education

	Year	
	1936	1947
Number	55	79

Source: (10a:23, 10b:15-16)

The scope of student personnel services was also affected by the veteran enrollments. Prior to the war, students with physical handicaps were a rarity on most campuses. Facilities were not constructed with the problems of the handicapped in mind. After World War II, the many disabled veterans who returned to the campuses found that arrangements were being made to accommodate them. UCLA, for example, installed concrete ramps into existing curbs to permit ease of street crossing. In addition, most buildings on the Westwood campus were made accessible by the installation of special entrances to elevators.

The establishment of Veterans' Administration College Guidance Centers on the campuses led to an increase in the number of institutions having guidance and testing facilities. Prior to 1940, few institutions had such facilities. Now, with counseling required for P.L. 16 veterans and optional for P.L. 346 veterans, programs were cooperatively established or expanded to meet veteran needs. After the pressure of veteran enrollments decreased, these facilities were usually turned over to the individual institution, where the facilities were made available to all students. In a study of the impact these centers had on counseling programs, Mitchell Dreese surveyed 243 of 415 guidance centers. Receiving 154 responses to his questionnaire (63%), he found that 87 (56%) had had no centrally organized guidance centers with a director in charge prior to inauguration of the VA contract. In addition, 57% indicated they intended to continue the centers essentially as they were, and 25% would retain the same functions but reorganize them.

Dreese summarizes by stating: "It is conservative to say that the VA college guidance center program, with its 415 demonstration centers, in the short space of four years has advanced the cause of vocational guidance by more than fifteen years of normal development." (12:457)

The pursuit of training by 7,800,000 of the 15 million veterans after the war also had an economic effect. Remembering the plight of many able-bodied World War I who--out of approximately four and one-half million servicemen returned to civilian life within a year of the Armistice--were never quite able to integrate themselves into the weak economic environment of the 1920's and '30's, the Nation's leaders were anxious to regulate the flow of men into the job market in a more orderly manner.[1] Instead of all 15 million World War II veterans being demobilized at once, over half were diverted to some form of training before seeking their place in the economy.

---

[1] A particularly poignant observation on the WW I veteran's situation was made by Ernest W. McFarland, U.S. Senator from Arizona, during the hearings preceding passage of P.L. 346:

> "We all know that many of the ex-servicemen wandered over the U.S. without jobs or means of livelihood after the last war. Altogether too many boys found their way into penitentiaries because of their inability to adjust themselves to changed conditions, many of whom could have been rehabilitated by the proper assistance, and would have become just as good citizens as they had been soldiers." (29:115)

The final point for consideration is that of the Federal government's role in higher education. Governmental support through the Ordinances of 1785 and 1787, or the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 had established a precedent for interest in educational problems. The 1930's saw this interest become more specifically focused through construction fund grants for tax-supported institutions and work scholarships for needy students under the National Youth Administration. As always, however, the primacy of the state in educational matters was maintained.

During hearings in the Senate on the G.I. Bill proposal, the American Council on Education's current president Dr. George F. Zook pointed out two possible incursions by the Government into this historic primacy: (1. the administration of the program by a federal agency (the Veterans' Administration), rather than through state organizations; and, (2. the uncertainties surrounding who would "approve" state institutions for veteran attendance. (29:130) A member of the hearing's subcommittee Senator Tom T. Connally of Texas, explained that the Veterans' Administration would play no more than a passive role in the process; and, would be turning both student and stipend over to the training institution with no strings attached. (29:130) As far as assuming an accreditation function, the actual law explicitly states that state agencies will supply lists of approved institutions to the Veterans' Administration(see Appendix I, "Part VIII, paragraph 4").

To erase any doubts as to the exact nature of this federal-state relationship, paragraph 8 of the law states:

> No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out the provisions of this part /Chapter IV, Part VIII, "Education of Veterans," P.L. 346/ shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any state educational agency, or state apprenticeship agency, or any educational or training institution. (See Appendix I)

In actual practice, relationships between the Veterans' Administration and state agencies were characterized by cooperation, rather than by any incursions.

Why Education?

The concluding section of this paper will deal with the question: "Why was education selected as a benefit for returning servicemen"? To those readers who have a personal familiarity with the times, the treatment of this question may appear stiff or incomplete. Such is often a result for those who must glimpse the past second-hand from written records, or consider the spoken words of others, with an empathy based on dissimilar backgrounds. However, just as Plato's cave dweller is initially unable to separate appearance and essence, he eventually--by wider and longer exposure--is able to bring reality into focus. The following treatment is meant to be a step in that direction.

Perhaps the simplest reason for providing veterans with educational benefits was that some servicemen had had their schooling interrupted by the war. It would seem only logical that those who served their government in time of war should not be disadvantaged by such service. Prevention of physical harm was not, strictly speaking, within the Government's power to prevent; however, after service, the Government could at least seek to return an individual to a situation similar to that which he left.

As far as disabled veterans and existing veterans' organizations were concerned, it could have been--and was--argued that benefits received by veterans in previous wars should also be available to those of subsequent wars. Thus, the precedent of retraining benefits provided by the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1918 discussed earlier should be followed with regard to the disabled veterans of World War II.[1]

In addition, many citizens felt that the plight of many able-bodied veterans after World War I should not be allowed to repeat. Returning to a depressed economy with little more than martial skills which bore little relationship to job requirements, these men were left to fend for themselves, often unsuccessfully.

---

[1] Warren H. Atherton of the American Legion's National Committee, in his address to the Senate subcommittee holding hearings on veterans' legislation, argued this point strongly. (29:20)

More recent economic developments made the provision of educational benefits attractive. The war had, as we have seen, drawn heavily on the educational and training institutions of the country to provide needed manpower and preparation. Many facilities which had been expanded to train these resources now lay idle. While enrollment of women students had increased somewhat, the significant loss of fee-paying male students, in conjunction with a decline in alumni gifts, pushed many of these institutions towards the brink of financial disaster.

Too, the thought of 15 million war-weary veterans--most of whom had recently been trained to destroy the Nation's enemies--descending onto the transitioning economy along with civilians also reconverting from wartime pursuits, brought sleepless nights to many of the Country's leaders. If only the return of these men to the economy could be spread over a period of time, then social and economic reconversion might be accomplished with a minimum of difficulty.

The financial plight of many educational institutions, and concern with the large number of returning servicemen, coupled with tremendous advances in technology like the gyroscope and atomic power, made provision for increased educational opportunities seem more appropriate as the war dragged on. While jobs for all in the reconverting economy would not be immediately available, the educational requirements which would be demanded by the new technology presented future opportunities for those who would seek the needed advanced preparation. By forestalling immediate re-entry into the economic arena, one might seek educational training which would prepare him for potentially limitless

future opportunity. Making the return to educational institutions economically feasible through the G.I. Bill was a giant step toward resolving the situation.

There was another more fundamental rationale underlying the choice. For perspective, let us return in time to June 18, 1779. The Revolutionary War has just begun, and our ancestors are attempting to consolidate their beliefs into a Nation based on the democratic principles for which they fought. Thomas Jefferson has just drafted "A Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge," and has presented it to the Virginia Assembly. In the bill, he discusses the importance of an educated citizenry in preserving its natural rights and guiding its destiny:

> yet experience hath shown, that even under the best forms, those entrusted with power have, in time, and by slow operations, perverted it into /government/ tyranny; and it is believed that the most effectual means of preventing this would be, to illuminate, as far as practicable, the minds of the people at large, and more especially to give them knowledge of those facts, which history exhibiteth, that, possessed thereby of the experience of other ages and countries, they may be enabled to know ambition under all its shapes, and prompt to exert their natural powers to defeat its purposes. (19:199)

Clearly, Jefferson viewed a certain level of education as essential for the citizens of this new Nation. A few sentences later, he asserts that, while all citizens need a common educational foundation, some citizens have been naturally endowed with more intellectual potential than others, and that the development of this potential is to the mutual benefit of all:

> those persons, whom nature hath endowed with genius and virtue, should be rendered by liberal education worthy to receive, and able to guard the sacred deposit of the rights and liberties of their fellow citizens, and that they should be called to that charge without regard to wealth, birth or other accidental condition or circumstance. (19:199-200)

There is a direct parallel between Jefferson's views in a developing society, and the considerations which must have motivated passage of the G.I. Bill. Since the early 1920's, public secondary education had increasingly become a reality for those who wished to take advantage of it. Yet, as one can see from the following table, 54.6% of all World War II veterans separated from the service had not completed high school. Only 19.1% had attempted college:

Table 4

Educational Level of Veterans
At Separation from the Armed Forces

Level Completed	Grade School	High School		College	
	0-8	0-3	4	1-3	4
Percentage	28.3	26.3	26.3	9.6	9.5

Source: (33:Appendix table 16)

It is possible that many did not desire to attend. Yet, what about those who might profit from greater education, yet could not raise the tuition nor afford the time; or, those who were barred by local racial bias and who could not afford travel to schools which might otherwise accept them? Then again, what about those students who had completed high school, but whose grades were not viewed as high enough for entrance by existing institutions of higher education; or, the large percentage of those whose education had been interrupted by the war? All these perplexing questions, similar to those which Jefferson must have considered, were probably being examined by those who framed the G.I. Bill.

As if using Jefferson's assertions as a springboard for their own ideas, the President's Commission on Higher Education submitted a similar post-war document in 1947.[1] In essence, Higher Education for American Democracy reported that:

1. there is a combination of non-specialized and non-vocational learning which should be the common experience of us all.
2. This combination of learning would enable citizens to understand, appraise, and re-direct forces, men, and events as these tend to strengthen or to weaken their liberty.
3. Every individual must be encouraged to carry his informal and formal education as far as his native capacities allow.
4. All youth should have access to tuition-free education through grade 14.

(22:45,9,101,37)

Perhaps the most striking statement of the report, however, was the revelation that--based on the Army General Classification Tests given to approximately 10 million servicemen during the war, 49% of these men had the ability to profit from at least two years of college, while at least 32% had the ability to complete at least 4 years of higher education. (22:9)

[1]While this report comes almost three years after the G.I. Bill was passed, it is this writer's opinion that most presidential commissions are appointed to investigate and confirm formally, trends or ideas already enjoying widespread acceptance. Thus, it most likely reflects opinion that weighed heavily on those who drafted and those who passed P.L. 346.

These two documents--written 158 years apart--suggest a view of education's role in American society which must have slowly but surely caught hold of the majority of Americans. World War II's conclusion marked another triumph for Democracy. In order to solidify this triumph and strengthen Democracy's daughters and sons even further, those obstacles which would deny access to a certain level of education for all must be diminished.[1] In addition, access to all levels of education--grade school to graduate department--must be provided those with the native talents to benefit from it.

To conclude this section, a review of the major points would be in order. First, we saw that the selection of education as a benefit for returning service personnel was based upon both short- and long-term considerations. Our financially suffering colleges, our reconverting and technologically expanding economy, and our militarily-trained servicemen all stood to benefit from such provision. Finally, the basic element in a democracy--its citizens--would be strengthened by the removal of barriers to a fundamental source of its strength.

---

[1]Of course, the question might be raised: "Why not provide federal support to everyone to insure their access to education at least through grade 14?" Briefly, one might respond that the level or "amount" of education which all citizens should receive was not agreed upon. Free public education through the high school level might be considered sufficient. Then, the resources required for such an undertaking, and the fact that the Federal government wished to let education remain largely in the states' domain might also be considered. Suffice it to say that the Commission did recommend tuition-free public education through grade 14, and did advocate a national scholarship program for at least 20% of the non-veteran undergraduates. For recommendations, see especially 22:52-56.

We've Only Just Begun
(A Conclusion of Sorts)

That the G.I. Bill was a significant piece of social legislation, no one will deny. That the large numbers of veterans pursuing training--especially higher education--after the war had an influence on college growth, student personnel program expansion, and admission standards broadening, no one will disagree. Yet, we must ask the question: "Of the 7,800,000 veterans who used their G.I. Bill educational benefits, would the 28.6% who pursued college-level training have done so anyway without the benefits"? In other words, what was the influence of the Bill on enrollments?

Frederiksen and Schraders' 1946-47 study of veteran and non-veteran freshmen at twelve college campuses indicates that the G.I. Bill had some influence. They reported that:

> Typically, in the basic twelve college groups, about ten percent of veterans would not have attended college without the educational benefits of the GI Bill, and another ten percent would probably not have attended. The proportion of veterans who reported that they probably or definitely would not have attended without veterans' benefits varied widely among the colleges. (17:326)

They also note that an earlier study by Ralph J. Strom (1948) on the subject made similar findings:

> the proportion of veterans who reported that they would not have attended without federal aid was approximately 20 percent in state universities, private and men's schools, municipal universities and liberal arts colleges. About 5 percent, in addition, reported that they did not know whether or not they would have attended without federal aid....the percentage who would not have attended among students enrolled in junior colleges and teachers colleges was about 30 percent. (17:35)

While these two studies suggest an important connection between benefit availability and college attendance, a number of studies[1] suggest that service exposure and experiences--not the G.I. Bill--were responsible. The importance of such findings are far-reaching. If individuals would have attended college anyway despite the financial hardships (or, if federal support through such legislation as P.L. 346 had no real impact on enrollment), then why should the Federal government spend its resources in this area? Carry the argument one step further and the whole question of need for federal support of any student--civilian or veteran--must be raised. It is not within the scope of this paper to answer such questions. Yet, a complete appreciation and assessment of the G. I. Bill's significance is not possible without such answers. On the one hand, the ground we have covered in this paper has been substantial; but on the other hand, it has merely given us a foundation on which to build a true evaluation.

[1]The interested reader may refer to (17:15) for study titles.

APPENDIX I

A LIST OF WORKS CONSULTED

1. Ackerman, William C. My Fifty Year Love-In at UCLA. Los Angeles: Fashion Press, Inc., 1969.

2. American Academy of Political and Social Science. Postwar Jobs for Veterans. Philadelphia: the Academy, 1945.

3. Atkinson, Byron H. "The G.I. Bill as a Social Experiment." School and Society, LXVIII (July, 1948), 43-44.

4. Atkinson, Byron H. "Social and Financial Adjustment of Veterans at UCLA." School and Society, LXXII (July, 1950), 24-27.

5. Atkinson, Byron H. "Veteran Vs. Non-veteran Performance at UCLA: The G.I. Bill as an Academic Experiment." Journal of Educational Research, XLIII (December, 1949), 299-302.

6. Braceland, Francis J. "The Retraining and Re-education of Veterans." (A lecture sponsored by the Nellie Heldt Lecture Fund.) Oberlin College: Oberlin Printing Co., 1945.

7. Barck, Oscar T., and Blake, Nelson M. Since 1900. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1959.

8. Brown, Francis J. Educational Opportunities for Veterans. Washington: American Council on Public Affairs, 1946.

9. California Department of Veterans' Affairs, Division of Services and Coordination. A Handbook of California Benefits for Veterans: 1946-1962. Sacramento, California: the Department.

10a. College Entrance Examination Board. Annuan Report: 1936. New York: the Board, 1936.

10b. College Entrance Examination Board. Annual Report: 1948. New York: the Board, 1948.

11. Dillingham, William P. Federal Aid to Veterans: 1917-1941. Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida Press, 1952.

12. Dreese, Mitchell. "Policies and Plans of College Guidance Centers Operating under VA Contracts." The Educational Record, XXX (October, 1949), 44-457.

13. Dumond, Dwight L. Roosevelt to Roosevelt: The United States in the Twentieth Century. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1937.

14. Educational Policies Commission. Report of the Commission. A Program for the Education of Returning Veterans. Washington: National Education Association, 1944.

15. England, Robert T. Twenty Million World War Veterans. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.

16. Erana, M.A., and Symons, Arthur. Veterans' Rights and Benefits. Washington: The Military Service Publishing Co., 1946.

17. Frederiksen, Norman, and Schrader, W.B. Adjustment to College: A Study of 10,000 Veteran and Non-veteran Students in Sixteen American Colleges. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1951.

18. Hollis, Ernest V. "Educational Level of Veterans and Post-war Enrollments." School and Society, LX (December, 1944), 353-355.

19. Jefferson, Thomas. "A Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge," in Honeywell, Roy J. The Educational Work of Thomas Jefferson. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1931.

20. Jordon, Thomas F. "How Many Wrongs Make a G.I. Bill of Rights." School and Society, LXVIII (September, 1948), 161-164.

21. Morse, Bradford. "The Veteran and His Education." Higher Education, XVI (March, 1960), 5-38.

22. President's Commission on Higher Education. Report of the Commission. Higher Education for American Democracy. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947.

23. President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions. Report of the Commission. Veterans in Our Society. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956.

24. Rivlin, Alice M. The Role of the Federal Government in Financing Higher Education. Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1961.

25. Rosenteur, Phyllis I. The Complete Book of Veterans' Benefits. New York: MACO Magazine Co., 1956.

26. Social Legislation Information Services, Inc. Social Legislation Handbook. Washington: the Corporation, 1956.

27. Strom, Ralph J. The Disabled College Veteran of World War II. Washington: George Banta Publishing Co., 1950.

28. U.S. Advisory Committee on the Study of Higher Education. Report of the Committee. Effects of Certain War Activities Upon Colleges and Universities. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1945.

29. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Finance. A Bill to Provide Federal Government Aid for the Readjustment in Civilian Life of Returning World War II Veterans. Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Finance, Senate, on S. 1617, 78th Congress, 2nd session, 1944.

30. U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Abstract of the United States: 1954. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1954.

31. U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports: Population Characteristics, Series P-20, No. 19 (1948).

32. University of Southern California. President's Report: 1948-1949. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1949.

33. Veterans' Administration. Information Bulletin DVB IB 24-71-2, dated 12 January 1971. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

APPENDIX II

AN ACT
TO PROVIDE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AID FOR THE
READJUSTMENT IN
CIVILIAN LIFE OF RETURNING
WORLD WAR II VETERANS

(CHAPTER 268)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Servicemen"s Readjustment Act of 1944".

TITLE II

Chapter IV - Education of Veterans

Sec. 400. (a) Subsection (f) of section 1, title I, Public Law Numbered 2, Seventy-third Congress, added by the Act of March 24, 1943 (Public Law Numbered 16, Seventy-eight Congress), is hereby amended to read as follows:

(f) Any person who served in the active military or naval forces on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of hostilites in the present war, shall be entitled to vocational rehabilitation subject to the provisions and limitations of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, part VII, or to education or training subject to the provisions and limitations of part VIII."

(b) Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), is hereby amended by adding a new part VIII as follows:

PUBLIC LAWS - CH. 268 - JUNE 22, 1914

"PART VIII"

1. Any person who served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or released there-from under conditions other than dishonorable, and whose education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service, or who desires a refresher or retraining course, and who either shall have served ninety days or more, exclusive of any period he was assigned for a course of education or training under the Army

specialized training program or the Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of his civilian course and was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, or shall have been discharged or realeased from active service by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability, shall be eligible for and entitled to receive education or training under this part: Provided, That such course shall be initiated not later than two years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the present war, whichever is the later: Provided further, That no such education or training shall be afforded beyond seven years after the termination of the present war: And provided further, That any such person who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service shall be deemed to have had his education or training impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with.

2. Any such eligible person shall be entitled to education or training, or a refresher or retraining course, at an approved educational or training institution, for a period of one year (or the equivalent thereof in continuous part-time study), or for such lesser time as may be required for the course of instruction chosen by him. Upon satisfactory completion of such course of education or training, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institutions, except a refresher or retraining course, such person shall be entitled to an additional period or periods of education or training, not to exceed the time such person was in the active service on or after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the war, exclusive of any period he was assigned for a course of education or training under the Army specialized training program or the Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of his civilian course and was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, but in no event shall the total period of education or training exceed four years: Provided, That his work continues to be satisfactory throughout the period, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution: Provided, however, That wherever the additional period of instruction ends during a quarter or semester and after a major part of such quarter or semester has expired, such period of instruction shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester.

3. Such person shall be eligible for and entitled to such course of education or training as he may elect, and at any approved educational or training institution at which he chooses to enroll, whether or not located in the State in which he resides,

which will accept or retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution finds him qualified to undertake or pursue: Provided, That, for reasons satisfactory to the Administrator, he may change a course of instruction: And provided further, That any such course of education or training may be discontinued at any time, if it is found by the Administrator that, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution, the conduct or progress of such person is unsatisfactory.

4. From time to time the Administrator shall secure from the appropriate agency of each State a list of the educational and training institutions (including industrial establishments), within such jurisdiction, which are qualified and equipped to furnish education or training (including apprenticeship and refresher or retraining training), which institutions, together with such additional ones as may be recognized and approved by the Acministrator, shall be deemed qualified and approved to furnish education or training to such persons as shall enroll under this part: Provided, That wherever there are established State apprenticeship agencies expressly charged by State Laws to administer apprentice training, whenever possible, the Administrator shall utilize such existing facilities and services in training on the job when such training is of one year's duration or more.

5. The Administrator shall pay to the educational or training institution, for each person enrolled in full time or part time course of education or training, the customary cost of tuition, and such laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similar fees as are customarily charged, and may pay for books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses, exclusive of board, lodging, other living expenses, and travel, as are generally required for the successful pursuit and completion of the course by other students in the institution: Provided, That in no event shall such payments, with respect to any person, exceed $500 for an ordinary school year: Provided further, That no payments shall be made to institutions, business or other establishments furnishing apprentice training on the job: And provided further, That if any such institution has no established tuition fee, or if its established tuition fee shall be found by the Administrator to be inadequate compensation to such institution for furnishing such education or training, he is authorized to provide for the payment, with respect to any such person of such fair and reasonable compensation as will not exceed $500 for an ordinary school year.

6. While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part such person, upon application to the Administrator, shall be

paid a subsistence allowance of $50 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $75 per month, if he has a dependent or dependents, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding thirty days in a calendar year. Such person attending a course on a part-time basis, and such person receiving compensation for productive labor performed as part of their apprentice or other training on the job at institutions, business or other establishments, shall be entitled to receive such lesser sums, if any, as subsistence or dependency allowances, as may be determined by the Administrator: Provided, That any such person eligible under this part, and within the limitations thereof, may pursue such full time or part-time course or courses as he may elect, without subsistence allowance.

7. Any such person eligible for the benefits of this part, who is also eligible for the benefit of part VII, may elect which benefit he desires: Provided, That, in the event of such election, subsistence allowance hereunder shall not exceed the amount of additi nal pension payable for training under said part VII.

8. No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out the provisions of this part, shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any State educational agency, or State apprenticeship agency, or any educational or training institution: Provided, That nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent any department, agency, or officer of the United States from exercising any supervision or control which such department, agency, or officer is authorized, by existing provisions of law, to exercise over any Federal educational or training institution, or to prevent the furnishing of education or training under this part in any institution over which supervision or control is exercised by such other department, agency, or officer under authority of existing provisions of law.

9. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and empowered to administer this title, and, insofar as he deems practicable, shall utilize existing facilities and services of Federal and State departments and agencies on the basis of mutual agreements with them. Consistent with the subject to the provisions and limitations set forth in this title, the Administrator shall from time to time prescribe and promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its purposes and provisions.

10. The Administrator may arrange for educational and vocational guidance to persons eligible for education and training under this part. At such intervals as he deems necessary,

he shall make available information respecting the need for general education and for trained personnel in the various crafts, trades, and profession: Provided, That facilities of other Federal agencies collecting such information shall be utilized to the extent he deems practicable.

11. As used in this part, the term educational or training institutions shall include all public or private elementary, secondary, and other schools furnishing education for adults, business schools and colleges, scientific and technical institutions, colleges, vocational schools, junior colleges, teachers colleges, normal schools, professional schools, universities, and other educational institutions, and shall also include business or other establishments providing apprentice or other training on the job, including those under the supervision of an approved college or university or any State department of education, or any State apprenticeship agency or State board of vocational education, or any State apprenticeship council or the Federal Apprentice Training Service established in accordance with Public, Numbered 308, Seventy-fifth Congress, or any agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government authorized under other laws to supervise such training.

SECTION 401. Section 3, Public Law Numbered 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 3. The appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, "Salaries and expenses, medical and hospital, and compensation and pensions', shall be available for necessary expenses under part VII, as amended, or part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a) and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amount or amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes thereof. Such expenses may include, subject to regulations issued by the Administrator and in addition to medical care, treatment, hospitalization, and prosthesis, otherwise authorized, such care, treatment, and supplies as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of part VII, as amended, or part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a)"

SECTION 402. Public Law Numbered 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section 4 to read as follows:

SECTION 4. Any books, supplies, or equipment furnished a trainee or student under part VII or part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a) shall be deemed released to him:

Provided, That he fail, because of fault on his part to complete the course of training or education afforded thereunder, he may be required, in the discretion of the Administrator, to return any or all of such books, supplies, or equipment not actually expended or to repay the reasonable value thereof."

SECTION 403. Paragraph 1, part VII, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a) (Public Law Numbered 16, Seventy-eight Congress), is hereby amended by inserting after the word "time" the words "on or" and deleting the date "December 6, 1941" and substituting therefor the date "September 16, 1940".

APPENDIX III
and
APPENDIX IV

ATTENDANCE AND ENROLLMENT IN GRADES 9-12 AND INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

	1929-30[a]	1939-40[a]	FALL '46[b]	FALL '47[b]	FALL '48[b]	1949-50[a]
Grades 9-12 and Postgraduate...	4,811,800	7,129,979	--	--	--	6,453,009
Higher Education Total.....	1,100,737	1,494,203	2,078,095	2,338,226	2,408,249	2,659,544
Veterans Total..	--	--	1,080,396	1,122,738	1,021,038	--
Veterans as a Percentage of Higher Education Total.....			.519	.480	.424	

[a]data obtained from Ralph J. Strom's The Disabled College Veteran of WWII, p.25.
[a]data obtained from Digest Of Educational Statistics, 1964 Edition published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, p. 112.

TOTAL NUMBER OF VETERANS TRAINED, LEVEL OF TRAINING, AND COST[a]

	WWII (ended)	CONFLICT (ended)	KOREAN (Nov. 70)	(NOV. 70) Veterans	Servicemen
Total Trained	7,800,000	2,391,000	2,181,643	1,321,805	156,420
o/o	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
College.....	2,230,000	1,213,000	1,207,521	798,303	39,614
o/o	28.6	50.7	55.3	60.4	25.3
Below College	3,480,000	860,000	811,890	398,764	116,806
o/o	44.6	36.0	37.2	30.2	74.7

[a]data obtained from Veterans Information Bulletin DVB IB 24-71-2

APPENDIX III

APPENDIX IV